

HANDOUTS

Methods for exploring faculty experiences with community engaged research

H. Anne Weiss, haweiss@iupui.edu

Lauren Wending, wendingl@iupui.edu

Kristin Norris, norriske@iupui.edu

Presented at the Assessment Institute in Indianapolis, Indiana on October 22, 2018.

Citation suggestion: Weiss, H.A., Wending, L., & Norris, K.E. (2018). *Faculty experiences with community Engaged Research: Challenges, successes, and recommendations for the future*. Presented at the annual Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN.

This page left blank intentionally.

Why this topic?

- Addressing questions regarding;
 - Degree(s) & level(s) that engagement is institutionalized, recognized & rewarded (institution / program / school / course).
- Need to go "beyond" traditional signifiers of engagement;
 - Looking at/through/with a certain constituents experiences (students, staff, faculty, admin., community).
- To inform key senior administrators; for informing policies & practices.



Why present on ways to explore this topic?

- To remind: There are multiple areas we need to explore when looking at community engagement in higher education.
- To encourage: You can/should do this too...
- To reinforce: Making connections between institutional research and community engagement questions/tasks/impact/etc.



Why now?

Why now, at our campus?

- Current implementation of 3 new system-level tracking mechanisms
 - Collaboratory + DMAI + IRB question about CER
- Conversations with faculty, data liaisons, other internal stakeholders
- IUPUI has a 5 year reporting cycle/plan
 - 2017-18: Campus-wide faculty survey – faculty satisfaction, intentions to stay or leave



TIMELINE-PROCESS Engaging Stakeholders + Generating Institution- Level Buy-In

Timeline

May 2017, Beginning=> Articulate inquiry questions, propose methodology, meetings, gathering input, meetings, gathering insights...

November 2017, Middle=> Review policy documents, recruitment of faculty, data collection, analysis, member checking, continuous analysis, entering into "reporting" phase...

Early 2019, Ending-Closing this out=> many meetings, gathering input, more meetings, gathering insight...*not really sure when it will "end", what the end product/output is, etc.*



Continuous Dialogue & Deliberation with Campus Stakeholders

- Vice Chancellor of Community Engagement
- Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 - Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 - Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Diversity + Inclusion
- Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research (OVCR)
- Center for Service + Learning (CSL)
- Faculty Learning Community on Public Scholarship
- Office of Community Engagement Staff (community liaisons)
- Data liaisons (informal but important role) in each school at our campus (over 18 individuals).



Multiple Stages/Projects

- Campus-level promotion and tenure policy review
 - IUPUI, MSU, UNCG, + UIC
- Exploring faculty's lived experience
- School-level promotion and tenure policy review



STAGE/PROJECT 1

Campus-Level Promotion and Tenure Policy Review

Objectives

- **Analyze** content and terminology within campus-level promotion and tenure guidelines at four (4) "highly engaged" peer institutions to **identify** how IUPUI and peer institutions discuss engaged scholarship + how frequently it's highlighted in promotion and tenure guidelines.



Methodology

- Content analysis; Coded for 29 key terms: frequency, location, relationship.

Community Based Learning	Internship	Mentor	Clinical	Patent	Trans-
Technical Report	Collab-	Application	Outreach	Involve	Board
Civic	Public Service	Community Service	Volunteer	Policy	Community Engagement
Action Research	Community Based Experience	Engaged Learning	Practicum	Community Based Research	Participatory Research
Public Scholarship	Technology Transfer	Neighborhood	Advisory Panel	Service Learning	



Findings

Frequency of all Terms within Campus-Level Guidelines				
	Teaching	Research	Service	Total
All Institutions	36	37	48	121
IUPUI	14	3	9	26
MSU	7	8	19	34
UIC	1	7	4	12
UNCG	16	19	16	51

Terms Not Appearing in ANY Document
Community Based Experience
Engaged Learning
Practicum
Community Based Research
Participatory Research
Public Scholarship
Technology Transfer
Neighborhood
Advisory Panel
Action Research



STAGE/PROJECT 2

Faculty's Lived Experiences

Objectives

1. **Model** institutional research as a channel/path for pursuing inquiry on community engagement.
2. **Engage** in dialogues and deliberations with multiple stakeholders surrounding community engagement & faculty experiences at our campus.
3. **Deepen, strengthen** support for faculty that do this work.



Intended Outputs

1. **Examples** of diverse ways to approach understanding faculty's experiences when conducting research in, with, or on the community.
2. **New and better relationships** with decision-makers at our campus_about when/where to include engaged work in aspects of reporting or promotion and tenure.
3. Colleagues at our campus **produce new, better and useful information and professional development opportunities** for IUPUI tenure-track faculty.



Population, Sample, Sampling Frame

Population	All any employees of IUPUI that utilize community-engaged methodologies or approaches when pursuing research and creative activities.
Sample	Tenure-track or tenured faculty at IUPUI's core schools (i.e., excluding School of Medicine) that utilize a CE approach in research and creative activities.
Sampling Frame	SEE HANDOUT; inclusion & exclusion criteria.



IUPUI

Recruitment, see handout

Email sent to Schools' Associate Dean for Research, Requested 1-3 faculty – 100% FTE, research expectation, tenured or tenure track	February 2018
Invited those nominated faculty (Invited n=45; Yes = 36), completed pre-task, then invited to 45 minute structured interview	February-March 2018
"Snowballed" Faculty (Invited n=56; Yes = 35) Please identify 1-3 faculty (within your school) who could offer an alternative perspective, in some regard.	March-April 2018
3 Focus Group Sessions (n=40), member checking.	April-May 2018



IUPUI

Data Collection

- Pre-task. Brief questionnaire of closed-ended questions to confirm community-engaged researchers (to some extent), to cue participants into topic, and gather demographics.
- Structured interviews. 1:1, usually in faculty's office; between 17-90 minutes, structured, audio recorded.
- Member Checking. Focus groups of 8-12 participants, 1 hour, audio recorded but not transcribed.



IUPUI

Pre-Task. Questionnaire, [see handout](#)

The Matrix				
Community partners help identify relevant (research) questions.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Community partners help plan the design of the methodology (e.g. recruitment & retention strategies).	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Community partners help select appropriate measures and data collection methods.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Community partners help gather data.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Community partners help analyze data.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Community partners help reach a consensus about findings, conclusions, and/or recommendations for implementing findings.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Community partners help disseminate results and/or prepare an action plan based upon findings.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often

Matrix from: Callison D, Kauper-Brown J, Seifer SD. *Community-Engaged Scholarship Toolkit*. Seattle: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. 2005. <http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info>.



Interview Questions

SEE HANDOUT=> Full interview protocol.

This was started by one of our team members, but was developed through multiple conversations and drafts.

A structured interview was undertaken in order to account for consistency among the research team and to be respectful to faculty's time.



Coding & Nodes

Nodes=> **SEE HANDOUT**

Coding=> Reminders: Code=verb; Node=noun.

- One practice round of coding was undertaken amongst the team and discussed for the sake of addressing inter-coder reliability.
- Deductive nodes were informed by the literature and team meetings.
- Emergent nodes were discussed on a weekly basis at team meetings.
- "Cleaning" of coding & nodes was done through three different cycles.

Software=> NVivo



Reporting, *sort of*...

Stakeholder discussions & listening tours

- Purpose, process, and why
- What we shared, why, and how we determined this
- Lessons learned
- What we still don't know



STAGE/PROJECT 3

School-Level Promotion and Tenure Policy Review

Objective

Gap analysis between peer institutions (project 1) faculty voices (project 2) and other IUPUI schools.

- Offer concrete recommendations and identify opportunities for improvement to each school included in project 2.

Outputs

The creation of new, better, different, or informed policy documents-someday.



Analysis

- Gap analysis. The method of marking gaps between "What is currently happening?" and "What should be happening? Based on best practices (Project 1 & literature) and/or insights from faculty's experiences (Project 2)?"

Current State	Desired State	Identified Gap	Gap due to knowledge, skill and/or practice	Methods used to Identify Professional Practice Gap
What is currently happening?	What should be happening?	Difference between what is and what should be.	Why do you think the current state exists? What is the underlying or root cause?	What evidence do you have to validate the gap exists?

- Currently ongoing. So far it is fascinating.



Findings

- Cannot make any resolute conclusions or comments on the gaps but...
 - The schools/disciplines/professions that you think would "get it", do.
 - The schools/disciplines/professions that you think don't "get it", don't.
- More to come! *This could be the most impactful part of our three part project- as far as immediately useful and "easy" to change.*



This page left blank intentionally.

Sampling Frame

- Target sample: A representative sample of tenure-tracked or tenured faculty from each of IUPUI's schools- except the School of Medicine- who are doing community-based or – engaged research. No one under the age of 18 will be asked to participate in this project.
 - **Inclusion criteria:** Considered full-time at IUPUI; Research must be an explicit expectation in their position/role; The university has an interest in capturing their research activity for any reason(s) and through any medium (e.g., Academic Analytics, faculty annual report, PIVOT, etc.); They have been known to pursue research questions with community. Specifically, a faculty member who has either:
 - Category 1: Sustained a long-term relationship with community partner(s) to conduct multiple [research] projects.
 - Category 2: Collaborates across multiple community partners to conduct various research projects in and with the community
 - **Exclusion criteria:** Individuals who are not expected to report on their research activity (e.g., clinical, lecturers, visiting scholars, non-tenured track); Individuals who have less than a 1:1 teaching load (e.g., Dean's, Associate Deans) to acknowledge the responsibilities related to research as opposed to administrative duties.
- Sampling will stop once saturation has been reached.

This page left blank intentionally.

Email sent to school's Associate Dean for Research

SUBJECT: Nominate 1-3 faculty members by Feb. 19th

Dear _____ [Assoc. Dean for Research; CC data liaisons]

The Offices of Community Engagement, Research (OVCR) and Academic Affairs are partnering on a study to **explore the lived experiences of faculty who work with the community when conducting research or creative activity**. The study is intended to develop a better understanding of what contributes to faculty success at IUPUI, the challenges they encounter, what support or offerings are most useful, and recommendations for improvement. This information will be used to inform future actions, programs, or initiatives - faculty development programming, incentives, and enhancements to policies.

We need your help. Please recommend, by February 19, at least one, but no more than three, faculty member(s) from your school who meet the following criteria:

- Full-time at IUPUI (100% FTE)
- Research is an explicit expectation of their position/role
- Known to pursue research questions with community (partners or members) or identifies as a public scholar.

Exclusion criteria: Please do not suggest individuals whose primary expectations are not related to conducting or planning research activity (e.g., clinical appointments, lecturers, visiting scholars, non-tenure track); or who have less than a 1:1 teaching load (i.e. have significant administrative responsibilities, e.g., Deans, Associate Deans).

Kristin Norris, Director of Assessment for the Office of Community Engagement, and her team will conduct a 30 min structured interview with the faculty member(s) you suggest. The interviewed faculty will be asked to identify two additional faculty, outside of his/her department, who may have had a different experience and could offer a different perspective (snowball sampling). To ensure that the faculty voice is accurately represented, all study participants will be invited to a 90 min "member checking" session (in late-April, early-May) where the emergent themes will be shared and faculty will be able to offer additional recommendations collectively.

Once you have provided the names, we will contact the faculty member(s) to begin scheduling interviews. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Kristin Norris at norriske@iupui.edu.

Thank you for your recommendations and continued leadership in research at IUPUI.

Sincerely,

Amy Conrad Warner, Margie Ferguson, PhD and Simon Atkinson, PhD

Attached: Interview Questions, Continuum of Research (Calleson, Kauper-Brown, Seifer, 2005).

Email sent to nominated faculty from their Associate Dean for Research

Greetings [REDACTED],

We are conducting interviews as part of a research study to increase our understanding of faculty experiences relating to community engaged research at IUPUI.

You have been identified by a colleague in your school to participate in this study. For additional information regarding this study, please see the attached information sheet.

If you wish to participate in this study, **please provide three dates and times that you are available to schedule a 1 hour window to conduct a 30-45 minute (in person or online) interview to discuss your experiences relating to community engaged research at IUPUI.**

The interview may take place in your office [INSERT OFFICE], or at another location of your choice.

Thank you,

Kristin Norris, PhD

Recruitment message to join focus groups for member checking purposes

Greetings,

We are touching base again regarding the community engaged research study in which you participated. We believe the information you've shared will be extremely useful for the campus. The next phase of the study includes **member checking our analysis through focus groups**. At this time, we are providing you with 3 optional dates/times and are asking for you to choose ONE that works best for your schedule. Once you respond to this e-mail, we will send you a meeting request so that it gets added to your calendar.

- DATE
- DATE
- DATE

Thank you!

Kristin Norris, PhD

This page left blank intentionally.

PRE-TASK QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO ALL RECRUITED FACULTY

Page 1

You are here because you have been nominated to participate in our inquiry project regarding faculty's experiences when conducting research or creative activities in or with the community- its organizations, problems, assets, people, issues, etc. Our goals are to better understand what contributes to the successes, challenges faced, opportunities utilized, and what recommendations these faculty have for improving the supports for people who do this work.

Below you will find a brief questionnaire regarding some of the practices related to conducting research in or with community. Completing this exercise will a) help frame the topic of this project for you and b) inform what questions our team will ask you in the subsequent interview- which you have either already scheduled or are in the process of scheduling with our team.

Completing this questionnaire should take no longer than 7 minutes. Thank you in advance for your time.

The project team seeks to better understand the process of a) engaging in this type of inquiry and b) how this type of work is recognized, rewarded, and evaluated. It is

our hope that this project produces new and useful information for bettering or strengthening the support and resources IUPUI can offer tenure-tracked or tenured faculty who conduct research in this manner.

Please provide your Name (First and Last): _____

Please note that your name will never be attributed to your responses. We are only asking for it now for the purposes of tracking who has completed this part of our project. No names or identifying information will be included on any data records or final reports. The data records, recordings and transcripts of interviews, and final reports are stored in a secure, password protected file and server.

PRE-TASK QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO ALL RECRUITED FACULTY

Page 2

Indicate below how often you have done the following with community- its organizations, problems, assets, people, issues, etc.- when conducting research, creative activity, or public scholarship:

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Community partners help identify relevant (research) questions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community partners help plan the design of the methodology (e.g., recruitment & retention strategies)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community partners help select appropriate measures and data collection methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community partners help gather data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community partners help analyze data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community partners help reach a consensus about findings, conclusions, and/or recommendations for implementing findings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community partners help disseminate results and/or prepare an action plan based upon findings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

PRE-TASK QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO ALL RECRUITED FACULTY

Page 3- [skip logic questions](#) if they answered “NEVER” to all above questions from “the matrix”

Do you have any intention for community partners to help identify relevant (research) questions in the future?

Yes No Maybe

Do you have any intention for community partners to help plan the design of the methodology (e.g. recruitment & retention strategies) in the future?

Yes No Maybe

Do you have any intention for community partners to help select appropriate measures and data collection methods in the future?

Yes No Maybe

Do you have any intention for community partners to help gather data in the future?

Yes No Maybe

Do you have any intention for community partners to help analyze data in the future?

Yes No Maybe

Do you have any intention for community partners to help reach a consensus about finding, conclusions, and/or recommendations for implementing findings in the future?

Yes No Maybe

Do you have any intention for community partners to help disseminate results and/or prepare an action plan based upon findings in the future?

Yes No Maybe

Do you have intention to do any of the following with community partners when conducting research in the future? Please select all that apply OR "none of the above" below.

- Help identify relevant (research) questions
- Help plan the design of the methodology (e.g. recruitment & retention strategies)
- Help select appropriate measures and data collection methods
- Help gather data
- Help analyze data
- Help reach a consensus about findings, conclusions, and/or recommendations for implementing findings
- Help disseminate results and/or prepare an action plan based on findings
- None of the above

PRE-TASK QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO ALL RECRUITED FACULTY

Page 4

Indicate the extent to which you think the existing systems and processes at IUPUI (e.g., annual report, promotion and tenure guidelines, school/department-specific processes) accurately represent ALL of your community-based or –engaged scholarship (teaching, research, creative activity, and/or service).

1 = Does not capture and accurately represent any of my engaged work 5 = All of my engaged work is captured and accurately represented

1 2 3 4 5

Tell us a bit about yourself.

How many years have you been at IUPUI?

Gender:

Male

Female

Other

Race/Ethnicity (Select all that apply):

American Indian/Alaskan Native

International

Asian

Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

Black/African American

White

Hispanic/Latino

Other

PRE-TASK QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO ALL RECRUITED FACULTY

Page 5

What School are you from? Choose one.

Dentistry
Informatics & Computing
Physical Education & Tourism
Management
Education
Kelley Business

SPEA
Engineering & Technology
Liberal Arts
Science Fairbanks Public Health
Lilly Family Philanthropy
Social Work

Health & Rehabilitation Sciences
McKinney Law
University Library
Herron Art & Design
Nursing

Please indicate your department(s) at that school.

Please indicate if you are currently tenured or tenure-tracked:

Tenured

Tenure-tracked

Neither

Former IUPUI Chancellor, Charles Bantz (PhD) once stated that, "a commitment to community engagement is in IUPUI's DNA" ([Bantz, 2015](#)). To what degree do you agree with that statement?

Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat disagree Strongly disagree

Think back to when you first came to IUPUI...Did the [campus culture for community engagement](#) influence your decision to come to IUPUI?

Definitely yes

Probably yes

Might or might not have

Probably not

Definitely not

PRE-TASK QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO ALL RECRUITED FACULTY

Page 5

Has this culture for community engagement influenced your decision to stay?

Yes No

Has this culture for community engagement influenced any thoughts you have or have had about leaving IUPUI?

Yes No

Final couple of questions.

How familiar are you with the campus-level promotion and tenure guidelines (i.e., policies) related to public scholarship?

Extremely familiar

Very familiar Moderately

familiar Slightly familiar

Not familiar at all

Again, think back to when you first interviewed for a faculty role at IUPUI...

Did you look at your school-level promotion and tenure guidelines (i.e., policies) prior to accepting your faculty role at IUPUI?

Yes

No

Start Recording & state out loud the following items.

Today's Date: _____

Participant ID #: _____

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

BRIEF OVERVIEW.

In partnership with OVCR and Academic Affairs, the Office of Community Engagement is exploring the lived experiences of faculty who, to some extent, work with communities on research or creative activity projects or see themselves as publicly-engaged scholars. Our goals are to better understand what contributes to the successes, challenges faced, opportunities utilized, and what recommendations these faculty have for improving support for those who work with the community when conducting research, creative activity, or public scholarship. As mentioned in our initial email to you, you were identified by either your Associate Dean for Research or another faculty member.

BEGINNING

As you may remember you completed a brief, online questionnaire. Right now I have a blank copy of part of that questionnaire- what we will call “the matrix”- for you to view, as we discuss your responses to that part of the questionnaire.

PROVIDE matrix/table from pre-task questionnaire to participant.

Go ahead and hold on to that handout for a minute as we move onto the interview questions.

OPENING- GETTING THEM TALKING about their experiences.

1. When first responding to “the matrix”, you indicated that you (rarely, sometimes, or often) engage with community-- its problems, people, organizations, issues, assets, etc.-- when doing research or creative activities... if you would, please provide a label for that kind of research, or, in other words, what would you call this type of research and tell me how you would define it.
 - a. Can you tell me about the process of conducting this type of research or creative activity? Describe a project you may have recently started or finished, that included some or all of these elements
2. During (their label for ‘this work’), what is the necessary knowledge or skills involved?
3. How did you gain those (the knowledge and/or skills you just mentioned)?
 - a. What or Who has helped you gain these knowledge or skills? (e.g., graduate program, faculty development, school/department culture, mentors)?
4. What are the typical products or deliverables that result from this work?
5. Please explain how you determine what to include and where to include products like that when reporting either in Activity Insights (a.k.a., Faculty Annual Report, DMAI) or when building your case of excellence (i.e., creating your promotion or tenure dossier).
 - a. What or who has guided your thinking or decisions about what to include and where to include it?

MIDDLE- Moving on to broader subjects around community engaged research.

Thank you for telling me a bit about your own experiences.

Structured Interview Protocol Continued...

Now we are moving into a part of the interview where we want to hear you describe how your school values, supports, recognizes, and evaluates this work.

6. Given your own experiences within your school, how is this work valued and/or recognized?
Perhaps in comparison to other research methods?
 - a. Can you share some examples of how your unit or department places value on this type of work?
7. In what ways has this work been supported or questioned and by whom (e.g., Department Chair, colleagues)?
 - a. Please make sure you are clear on if they are talking about “supported” or “questioned” here.
8. Given your experiences at your school, can you tell me how this work is evaluated?
 - a. ...evaluated by P&T review committees? ... by those who make decisions regarding your productivity, promotion, or tenure status?
9. Now, a bit broader than your school: Are there *any* campus offices, initiatives, programs, or workshops that have provided you with support and resources related to this work?
 - a. So again, that was... offices... initiatives... programs... workshops... other...

Now, just two more questions...before we wrap this up.

CLOSING- Final thoughts

10. If IUPUI wants to attract, retain, and/or promote this kind of work amongst faculty, do you have any recommendations? If so, what recommendations can you offer?
11. Is there anything else you want to tell us about your experiences in/with this kind of work?

SNOWBALLING.

Again, thank you for participating! We are still in the phase of data collection for this inquiry project, which includes snowball sampling. To that end...

1. Can you recommend another tenured or tenure-track faculty member from a different department but within your school who may have had a different experience or could offer an alternative perspective regarding how (their label for 'this work') is recognized, supported, valued, documented, or evaluated throughout their career at IUPUI ?
 - a. Name up to 2 people.
 - b. NOTE: While we appreciate and value that HOW one approaches working in or with community is/should be very different (for example, given disciplinary or paradigmatic differences) we are really/actually interested in a variety of experiences related to including this work in promotion and tenure exercises (faculty annual reporting, creating a promotion dossier or “case for excellence” in the area of research or creative activity).
 - c. Make sure to get the correct spelling and their department within the school.
 - d. We aren't really looking for people who just 'don't do it.
2. Would you be willing to participate in the next step in this project: member checking our analysis of these transcripts? This would involve attending a focus group experience for only those who participated in this phase of the project. We will offer 2-3 dates that will take place before, during, and after finals week. We are not asking for an RSVP right now, but do want to know if you would like to participate any further (Y/N) so that we can send you a meeting request. We value your participation and want to ensure we accurately represent your collective voices and offer all of you an opportunity to discuss recommendations for how this work is recognized, supported, and evaluated as a group. May I invite you to that aspect of our process? (Y/N)

CER Project2018_NODES

<div> <div>NODES</div> <div>Sub-nodes</div> <div>Sub-sub nodes</div> </div> <div>Description</div>	
Q01p1What do they call it	Referring to the label or name they provide for this work
Discipline or Field specific	
Q001p2How do they define it	how do they define this work
Defining it outside of THE MATRIX	The subject's definition does not necessarily align well with any specific rows of "the Matrix"
implementing an intervention in a CP	
Matrix R1, CPs help ID relevant RQs	Subject refers to row 1 in "The Matrix"= community partners help identify relevant (research) questions.
Matrix R2, CPs Plan design methods of research project	Subject refers to Row 2 of "The Matrix"= Community partners help to plan the design of the methodology.
CP and faculty recruit study participants together	
Matrix R3, CPs gather data	Subject refers to Row 3 of "the matrix"= Community partners help gather data.
Matrix R4, CPs analyze data	Subject refers to Row 4 of "the matrix"= Community partners help analyze data.
Matrix R5, CPs deliberation on findings	Participant refers to Row 5 of "the matrix"= Community partners help reach a consensus about findings, conclusions, and/or recommendations for implementing findings.
Matrix R6, CPs disseminate	Subject refers to row 6 of "the matrix"= Community partners help disseminate results and/or prepare an action plan based upon findings.
What is it NOT	
Q02p1 necessary KNOW for doing this work	What is the necessary KNOWledge for doing this work, on apart of them being faculty conducting research in/with community
KNOW community context	they have to understand the context of the community in/with which this work is happening
KNOW community participatory engaged research methods	
KNOW relationship or collaboration building	
KNOW roles for community	Referring to understanding the role of the community in this work.
KNOW roles of themselves	Referring to having to understand what role they, as the faculty, play.

Weiss, H.A., Wendling, L., & Norris, K.E. (2018). Faculty experiences with community Engaged Research: Challenges, successes, and recommendations for the future. *Presented at the annual Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN.*

CER Project2018_NODES

<div> <div>NODES</div> <div>Sub-nodes</div> <div>Sub-sub nodes</div> </div> <div>Description</div>	
KNOW traditional (positivist) scientific process methodology inquiry methods	Referred to possessing the necessary knowledge of conducting research in their discipline or otherwise.
KNOW, CER methodology	
KNOW, content expertise	
KNOW, evaluation skills and methods	
KNOW, knowledge that the community partner should have	
KNOW, mixed methods	
KNOW, respect for community	
Navigating Bureaucracy	
Q02p2 necessary SKILLS for doing this work	What is the necessary SKILLS for doing this work, on apart of them being faculty conducting research in/with community
Communication with Community	
Empathy	
Field or Disciplinary skills	
Research or Methodology Skills	
SKILL Communication with CP	
SKILL designing research	
SKILL example	Example of Skills of CER
SKILL manage time, multiple projects	
SKILL Relationship building	refer to relationship building
SKILL, communication	
SKILL, flexibility, patience, respect for CPs NEEDS	articulating something about how CPs needs are different from faculty and therefore a skill is recognizing that and having something related to being flexible, being patient and respecting those differences in needs for the process, outputs, and impact/outcome.
SKILLS communication	
SKILLS communication, listening	

Weiss, H.A., Wendling, L., & Norris, K.E. (2018). Faculty experiences with community Engaged Research: Challenges, successes, and recommendations for the future. *Presented at the annual Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN.*

CER Project2018_NODES

NODES Sub-nodes Sub-sub nodes	Description
SKILLS Community context	Sussing out the context of the community in/with which THIS WORK must be done.
SKILLS language translation_visual design	
SKILLS roles for community	referring to having the skill to identify the role(s) of the community in this work
SKILLS roles of themself	Referring to having the skill to fulfill role is in this work.
SKILLS translation	
Q02p3 necessary OTHER for doing this work	Anythign else that is necessary for doing this work, on apart of them being faculty conducting research in/with community
Q03 How did you gain these knowledge or skills	HOW did they gain the things they just mentioned throughout Q2
Community	
Learn by Doing	
Q3a WHAT helped them gain these things	
Discipline or field if very APPLIED	articulating how their field or discipline is applied in nature and therefore it allowed for themt o gain the necessary KSAs to do this work.
Example	Example
Graduate school	Referred to graduate schooling as helping them do this work
Job prior to IUPUI	
meeting with CPs	
Office or Center	
personality traits	
Practice	
Practitioner Community	
Previous career	
Previous experience	
Previous work experience	
Previous work experiences, prior to IUPUI	

Weiss, H.A., Wendling, L., & Norris, K.E. (2018). Faculty experiences with community Engaged Research: Challenges, successes, and recommendations for the future. *Presented at the annual Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN.*

CER Project2018_NODES

<div> <div>NODES</div> <div>Sub-nodes</div> <div>Sub-sub nodes</div> </div> <div>Description</div>	
Previously existing community partnerships, from campus	Referrign to how other campus entities already have communtiy partners and so the faculty rely on them to assist in doing this work
Time in Community	
Q3b WHO helped them gain these skills	Who helped them to gain skills or do this work
Colleague	
Community Partners	
Dean or higher	named a dean or other, higher administrator who has helped them gain those necessary KSAs for doing this work
Family	
Mentor	Mentor could be someone here at IUPUI or previous experience, but someone they consider to be a mentor
Practitioner Community	
Q3c OTHER HELP to gain KSAs for this work	OTHER knowledge, skills, or abilities they listed as necessary for this work
Development of center	
Listening or Observing	
school of hard knocks, learning to change based on mistakes	Making mistakes, learning from them, and doing things differently in the future
Q3d necessary SKILLS for doing this work	
Self Taught	
Years of Experience	
Q04 Examples of products or deliverables	Question asked: What are the typical products or deliverable that result form this work?
Academic conference, presentation	
Academic presentation, conference	
art, a thing	
Blog or Online Presence	
Community presentation	
Community relationships	

Weiss, H.A., Wendling, L., & Norris, K.E. (2018). Faculty experiences with community Engaged Research: Challenges, successes, and recommendations for the future. *Presented at the annual Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN.*

CER Project2018_NODES

<div> <div>NODES</div> <div>Sub-nodes</div> <div>Sub-sub nodes</div> </div> <div>Description</div>	
Conference Presentations	
contracts client based work	
Creative Activities or Products	
Digital Product - Video, software	
Disconnect of product needs	
Employment	
Exhibit, creative work - physical	
Experience - learning	
grants as output	referring to seeking or getting a grant AS A RESULT of this work
Intangibles	
journal or science article	Describing a traditional academic publication as a product or deliverable.
Knowledge resource FOR community	Describing, usually generally, an example of a product or deliverable that they believe is useful to the community for the sake of (new) knowledge generation and/or empowerment.
meetings, facilitating convening hosting	
open source data, dissemination products that inform practice	
partnerships	
Podcast, media appearance	
policy, influence, rewrite local, state, national policy	
presentation	
Presentation - Academic World	
Presentation for or in the community	
presentation, academic setting	
presentations	
press release	Example of having someone or themselves write up a press release as a product or deliverable of this work.

Weiss, H.A., Wendling, L., & Norris, K.E. (2018). Faculty experiences with community Engaged Research: Challenges, successes, and recommendations for the future. *Presented at the annual Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN.*

CER Project2018_NODES

NODES Sub-nodes Sub-sub nodes	Description
program implementation, intervention	
programming for community	
Programming or Intervention	
reports, memos, white papers	
Students	
students as deliverable to CP	
Tool FOR community	referring to the faculty member creating something FOR the community to use toward creatign differences in their own community.
Q05a what and WHERE to include this work	Explaining how they determine what to inlude and where to include products like that when reporting either in Activity insights or when building your case of excellence.
Confusion over which bucket (R, S, T)	
Frustrations	
I don't know	
Process of decision	How faculty make decisions about what to place and where
Process of Decision Making	
Service vs research	
Teaching	
Where, additional place	
Where, DMAI FAR or Annual Reporting	Giving an example of puting an artifact within DMAI or faculty annual reporting systems on campus
Not sure where to include it	Indicated they are not sure of the new DMAI system and where to include materials produced
Research Bucket	Research component of P and T
Examples	
Research or Scholarship of Application or Engagement	Within DMAI or reporting, they put it in the research category
Service Bucket	
Examples	

Weiss, H.A., Wendling, L., & Norris, K.E. (2018). Faculty experiences with community Engaged Research: Challenges, successes, and recommendations for the future. *Presented at the annual Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN.*

CER Project2018_NODES

NODES Sub-nodes Sub-sub nodes		Description
Service Category		Typically counts as service
Teaching Bucket		
Where, PROMO materials		Describing what to include in their case of excellence, i.e., their dossier for promotion and or tenure
Where, They DO NOT include it in these platforms		Basically stated outright that they do not include this work in either of the systems for faculty annual reports or their dossier.
Q05b Who or What as influenced WHERE to place this work		Talking about who or what has influenced their understanding of where this work fits in to annual reporting.
Colleague		
Colleagues or Deans or Leadership		
Departmental or School colleagues		
Dept Chair or Dean		
Descriptions or Instructions of where to place things		
Document Instructions or Language		Added this as it was stated clearly that they were following instructions on the system - so following university instruction
Employment before coming to IUPUI		Faculty articulated that they were previously employed and that is where they learned the bulk of how or where to include this work in reporting or promo systems.
Examples		
Faculty Resources		
IUPUI Community of Practice		
IUPUI Staff		
Mentor		A mentor helped them figure out how to document either in DMAI or when buliding their case of excellence
No influence, no guiding or influence		
Professional associations		
self-taught, on my own		
What influence, offers example of what needs 2B articulated WHEN including this work		Referring to what the faculty member would include in a faculty annual report or dossier for promotion when including this work.

CER Project2018_NODES

<div> <div>NODES</div> <div>Sub-nodes</div> <div>Sub-sub nodes</div> </div> <div>Description</div>	
What influence, Other colleges or universities	
What influence, other researchers	
What influence, promotion committees	
Who influences, chair of annual review or PT committees	
Who, colleagues	
Who, department chair	
Who, specific person- not chair or other PT committee type person	
Workshop	They attended a workshop
Q06 SCHOOL LEVEL- how work is VALUED and or RECOGNIZED	Broad prompt for how this work is valued and/or recognized within their school
Examples of recognizing this work	
example, RECOGNITION, giving awards	
example, RECOGNIZED through superficial attaboys or is given lip-service	
Examples of valuing this work	
example, VALUE Alignment with mission statement, guidelines, etc.	
example, VALUE giving time to community	
example, VALUE is tied to students, recruiting students, teaching students, seeing students produce and work with community	
example, VALUE it because the focus of their CER is hot right now	

CER Project2018_NODES

<div> <div>NODES</div> <div>Sub-nodes</div> <div>Sub-sub nodes</div> </div>		Description
	example, VALUE seen because someone pushes it out to others either internally or externally	
	example, VALUE seen through school or other PnT policy documents	
	example, VALUES because it is inherent to the discipline or school	
	Discipline-specific	
	Inherent in Discipline	
	General statement indicating valuing, recognizing, supporting, getting credit for this work	
	It's not Discouraged- no one tells me I cannot do it	
	Statement relates to, it is NOT valued or recognized	
	Traditional Research OR traditional outputs are valued or recognized kind of a yes, but...	recognized or valued as a "yes, but you better get something that looks like a traditional scholarly product out of this"
	Q07 this work SUPPORTED or QUESTIONED	
	Examples of how this work is supported	
	example, of CENTER or unit for supporting aspects of this work, infrastructure	
	example, of CENTER or unit for supporting aspects of this work, infrastructure	
	example, of PERSON for supporting aspects of this work, infrastructure	
	example, of PERSON for supporting aspects of this work, infrastructure	subject offered an example that either outright or basically gave us the impression that their school has some sort of PERSON to support

Weiss, H.A., Wendling, L., & Norris, K.E. (2018). Faculty experiences with community Engaged Research: Challenges, successes, and recommendations for the future. *Presented at the annual Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN.*

CER Project2018_NODES

NODES Sub-nodes Sub-sub nodes		Description
example, supported because it helps connect students with community		
example, SUPPORTED by attending events		
example, SUPPORTED through funding		funding from the actual school or department being put forward for the project
Example, MONEY		
Generally supported		
Public Scholar Title		
Supported through messaging, lipservice		Support is given because it makes the school look good (PR). But no other ways
Verbal or Written Praise		
Verbal support		
statement relates to, it is NOT questioned		
statement relates to, it is NOT supported		literally stated something close to this
example, that this work is questioned		
Invisible- Invisibility		
Methodology		
Outputs		
Q08 example of EVALUATE this work		Given your experience can you tell me how this work is evaluated.
Committees		
Could not give example		
Criteria for Public Scholarship		
example, advocating for how		
example, impact		
example, of CENTER or unit that has a role in evaluating this work, infrastructure		

CER Project2018_NODES

NODES Sub-nodes Sub-sub nodes	Description
example, of PERSON that evaluates aspects of this work, infrastructure	
example, relationship building or collaboration	gave this as an example of something that should be considered with evaluating this work
example, time commitment	articulated that this should be considered WHEN evaluating this work.
Example, traditionally	
Impact	
Just like any other work	
Locally vs. Globally	
Money	
National vs local	
Research vs service	
seen as less than	
statement relates to, it is NOT evaluated	states something close to this- that they don't believe the work is evaluated
Storytelling	
Traditional ways of evaluation	
Traditionally	
Traditionally (publications, funding, etc.)	
Q09 ANY BROAD examples of support or resources they have taken advantage of	anything having to do with ANY campus office, initiative program or workshop that they have taken advantage of related to this work
Could name something, but did not access or use them	Acknowledged that they have heard of something (award, person, grant, center), but have not accessed or leveraged them for whatever reason.
Could not give example	
example, of CENTER or unit for support or resources utilized	they named a center or unit on campus that they have utilized or a resource offered by a center or unit on campus.
example, of PERSON that has supported them in this work	

CER Project2018_NODES

<p>NODES</p> <p>Sub-nodes</p> <p>Sub-sub nodes</p>	<p>Description</p>
example, of RESOURCE they have taken advantage of for this work	
example, of WORKSHOP or EVENT they have take advantage of for this work	
Example, OFFICE	
Example, PROGRAM	
Institute(s)	
Q10 Recommendations for IUPUI	If IUPUI wants to attract, retain, and/or promote this kind of work amongs faculty, do you have any recommendations? If so, what recommendatins can you offer?
Change P and T Structure	
Recommend, consider how much time this takes, PnT	
Recommendation, balanced case, no buckets, PnT	
Recommendation, evaluation of this work	Articulates an idea or recommendation about evaluating this work.
Recommendation, recognize nontraditional products or outputs	
Recommendation, walk the talk-promotion	illustrates how iupui rhetorically embraces CE but does not literally practice that when it comes to their experiences as being promoted within the ranks of faculty in their school or beyond.
Recommendation, better understanding of CER	
Recommendation, clearer reporting, documentation areas for CE	
REcommendation, focusing efforst on certain problems	
Recommendation, it must infiltrate every level, structure impedes understanding and acceptance	subject is articulating that they see this work promoted, valued, or recognized elsewhere but that it is not trickling down or over to their actual experience in their school.

Weiss, H.A., Wendling, L., & Norris, K.E. (2018). Faculty experiences with community Engaged Research: Challenges, successes, and recommendations for the future. *Presented at the annual Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN.*

CER Project2018_NODES

NODES Sub-nodes Sub-sub nodes	Description
Recommendations, Resource or Support Needed	
formal training	
incentives needed	
money, grants needed	referring how they need monies or dollars FOR DOING of this work (not necessarily as a product OF DOING this work)
Recommendations, Support NEEDED	
Collaborative opportunities, networking	
Networks	
Communications	
General comment about needing support, to be supportive	
Infrastructure	
mentors	
person, liaison, leadership	
time needed	
Workshops	
Recommendations, walk the talk- hiring or recruitment	give examples of how rhetorically getting it but NOT literally getting it could affect IUPUI's efforts to recruit faculty who do this work
Q0011 Anything else	Is there anything else you wan tto tell us about your experiences in/with this work?
Identity andOR Motivation	How the subject talks about why they do this work and/or where the identity of doing CER came from.
came from course-teaching experience or pedagogy	
Direct contact with community or issue	
Discipline-based	
Familial	

Weiss, H.A., Wendling, L., & Norris, K.E. (2018). Faculty experiences with community Engaged Research: Challenges, successes, and recommendations for the future. *Presented at the annual Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN.*

CER Project2018_NODES

<div> <div>NODES</div> <div>Sub-nodes</div> <div>Sub-sub nodes</div> </div> <div>Description</div>	
improve course or student learning	
influencing policy or legislation	
Natural Inclination	
peers or allies also engaged or mentored them into this	
Professional interests	
something happend	
X Barriers of Challenges in DOING this work	Articulating the barriers or challengest to doing CER with community as a faculty member with IUPUI.
buearacracy	
current PnT process at IUPUI	
disconnect between campus and school levels	when valuing, recognizing or promoting this work the subject articulated that there is a barrier because of the disconnect or lack of accountabiity from the top down. meaning, the campus-level can say or show value, recognition, and promotion ofhtis work but it is not mandated at the school-level and therefore the lived experience within or at the school level is that this work is not valued, recognized, or supported.
Disconnect between CPs and campus or researcher	
Emotional Experience	
money- monetary	
Non-disclosure	
political nature of CER	
poor student interactions	
Publication Process	
time- time consuming	
X Barriers or Challenges in DOCUMENTING	Articulating the barriers or challenges in documenting CER for faculty at IUPUI.
Can't document experiences	
Classifying as research	
current PnT process at IUPUI	

Weiss, H.A., Wendling, L., & Norris, K.E. (2018). Faculty experiences with community Engaged Research: Challenges, successes, and recommendations for the future. *Presented at the annual Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN.*

CER Project2018_NODES

NODES Sub-nodes Sub-sub nodes		Description
disconnect between school and campus levels		
Impact		
Local, National		
Misunderstandings		
Money-Monetary		
Political nature of CER		
Politics-Bureacracy		
risky- professional risk		
Structures- Bureaucracy		
Time		
we risk commodifying community engagement		
ZZ Example of SPOOKY story		Pulling out a long quote with a "good" spooky story of how IUPUI is not valuing, supporting, or recognizing this work. GOAL is to create a narrative (500 words or less) of a spooky story to tell during some point of our report out cycle.

This page left blank intentionally.